

Comments on FEC proposals for IEEE 802.16.1 Air Interface

IEEE 802.16 Presentation Submission Template (Rev. 8)

Document Number: 802.16.1pp-00/32

DATE: 2000-07-12

Source:

Moshe Ran

TelesciCOM

8 HAMACTESH st. HOLON, 58810, ISRAEL

Voice: +972-3-5589595/208

Fax: +972-3-5589091

E-mail: mran@telescicom.com

Venue:

This doc is to be presented for discussion in 802.16.1 FEC Ad Hoc meeting session #8

Base Documents:

802.16.1pc-00/32r1

Purpose:

Summarizing results and Recommendations for FEC considerations

Notice:

This document has been prepared to assist IEEE 802.16. It is offered as a basis for discussion and is not binding on the contributing individual(s) or organization(s). The material in this document is subject to change in form and content after further study. The contributor(s) reserve(s) the right to add, amend or withdraw material contained herein.

Release:

The contributor grants a free, irrevocable license to the IEEE to incorporate text contained in this contribution, and any modifications thereof, in the creation of an IEEE Standards publication; to copyright in the IEEE's name any IEEE Standards publication even though it may include portions of this contribution; and at the IEEE's sole discretion to permit others to reproduce in whole or in part the resulting IEEE Standards publication. The contributor also acknowledges and accepts that this contribution may be made public by IEEE 802.16.

IEEE 802.16 Patent Policy:

The contributor is familiar with the IEEE 802.16 Patent Policy and Procedures (Version 1.0) <<http://iee802.org/16/ipr/patents/policy.html>>, including the statement "IEEE standards may include the known use of patent(s), including patent applications, if there is technical justification in the opinion of the standards-developing committee and provided the IEEE receives assurance from the patent holder that it will license applicants under reasonable terms and conditions for the purpose of implementing the standard."

Early disclosure to the Working Group of patent information that might be relevant to the standard is essential to reduce the possibility for delays in the development process and increase the likelihood that the draft publication will be approved for publication. Please notify the Chair <<mailto:r.b.marks@ieee.org>> as early as possible, in written or electronic form, of any patents (granted or under application) that may cover technology that is under consideration by or has been approved by IEEE 802.16. The Chair will disclose this notification via the IEEE 802.16 web site <<http://iee802.org/16/ipr/patents/letters>>.

General Remarks

- Four distinct FEC schemes were introduced for DL:
 - RS + CC, RS : mode A of draft PHY
 - RS + BC, RS: mode B of draft PHY
 - BTC : Hamming PC, Parity PC
- Three basic FEC schemes were introduced for UL:
 - RS, RS+BC
 - BTC (several variants)

Down Link FEC

- DL characteristics:
 - multilevel modulations: 4-16-64 QAM
 - fixed\adaptive modulations
 - support continuous or burst modes
 - high code rate (0.6 to 0.9) and large blocks are desired. Should decide if ~ 0.5 is required
 - fixed\adaptive (flexible) code rate ?!
 - CRC !?
 - Large Interleaver is necessary MODE A

General remarks (cont.)

- UL characteristics:
 - support high order modulations: 4-16-64 QAM
 - burst modes only
 - low\medium code rate (0.4 to 0.7) is expected
 - short blocks (5,14,18 bytes etc.) are expected (signaling purpose)
 - CRC !?
 - NO Interleaver

DL and UL have different characteristics

TABL1: BTC vers. RS comparison

note: RS analysis is semi-analytic UB meeting
 BTC both H/W finite word and analytic, UB is not met

	Eb/N0 dB E-6 QPSK	Eb/N0 dB E-9 QPSK	Eb/N0 dB E-6 64QAM	Eb/N0 dB E-9 64QAM	Ref.
RS(204,188) r=0.9216	6.99	7.69	14.90	15.68	QH
RS(138,128) r=0.9275	7.36	8.25	15.33	16.30	QH
RS(144,128) r=0.8889	6.87	7.60	14.75	15.58	QH
RS(69,53) r=0.7681	6.84	7.67	14.65	15.58	QH
BTC, 0.88	3.8	4.2	11.1	11.4	Wil
BTC, 0.79	3.5	4.3	11	12	RW

Comments on RS vers. BTC

- BTC performs >3dB better than RS only at the same rate
- BTC requires larger block sizes to achieve high rate and high coding gain. **(relevant to DL modes)**.
- shortening BTC allows shorter block size with reduced rate
--> coding gain remains almost constant
- shortening RS keeping $t=8$ is not a good practice for short block codes used for signaling **(relevant to UL modes)**

Conclusions:

RS only in DL variants as proposed in the PHY draft are 3dB inferior to BTC @ same code rate. BTC can further be improved to approach Union Bound.

TABL2: BTC vers. RS+BC comparison

note: RSP analysis is semi-analytic UB meeting
 BTC results are H/W finite word, far from UB

	Eb/N0 dB E-6 QPSK	Eb/N0 dB E-9 QPSK	Eb/N0 dB E-6 64QAM	Eb/N0 dB E-9 64QAM	Ref.
RSP(204,188) r=0.8192	5.55	6.16			QH, R
RSP(138,128) r=0.8245	5.90	6.62			QH,R
RSP(144,128) r=0.79	5.48	6.11			QH,R
RSP(69,53) r=0.6828	5.54	6.23			QH,R
BTC, 0.88	3.8	4.6	11.1	11.4	Wil
BTC, 0.79	3.5	4.3	11	12	RW

RS+BC vers BTC

- Gray mapping and soft decision decoders for both cases
- MODE B has also $(40,32) + \text{RS}$ and $(48,32) + \text{RS}$.

But, latest contribution pc-00/31 considers only RSP codes and concatenation of RS + $(24,16)$.

- Performance of RSP were simulated - (for $q=3$ add 0.3 dB)

BTC performs ~2dB better than RSP @same code rate

- Further analysis is required to compare DL low code rates variants of RS+BC vers. BTC. Much better flexibility to BTC since large codes for MODE A (see pc-00/35) and small codes for MODE B are supported.
- Only partial UB analysis related with QPSK is available with current contributions (RSP, RSV and BTC)

TABL3: BTC vers. RS+CC comparison

two semi-analytic “RSV” UB meeting given
 BTC results are H/W finite word, far from UB

	Eb/N0 dB E-6 QPSK	Eb/N0 dB E-9 QPSK	Eb/N0 dB E-6 64QAM	Eb/N0 dB E-9 64QAM	Ref.
RS(204,188)+V(1/2) r=0.461	2.56? 3.4	2.95? 3.6			QH FL
BTC, r=0.45	1.5	1.8			Wil
RS(204,188)+V(2/3) r=0.614	3.11? 3.75	3.48? 4.0			QH FL
RS(204,188)+V(3/4) r=0.691	3.58? 4.125	3.95? 4.50			QH FL
RS(204,188)+V(5/6) r=0.768	4.15? 4.75	4.50? 5.0			QH FL
RS(204,188)+V(7/8) r=0.806	4.55? 5.125	4.89? 5.375			QH FL
BTC, r=0.79	3.5	4.3	11	12	RW
BTC, r=0.88	3.8	4.0?			Wil

BTC vers. RSV

- RSV analysis of QH is over optimistic both QH and FL give non realistic slop for BER VERS. E_b/N_0 curves.
- Effective RSV Block size should be $I \cdot K$, where $I=12$ is inteleaver depth
- fair comparison between BTC and RSV @ same code rate implies at least 1.5dB better performance
- **Both RSV and BTC are concatenation of two codes. However, BTC represents much better concatenation strategy: replacing Interleaving with large codes, SISO**